

Handwritten initials or mark.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/854,149	05/11/2001	Steven Weil	MSI-747US	6784

22801 7590 09/26/2005

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/854,149

Applicant(s)

WEIL ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 45-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43 and 45-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment, filed 22 July 2005, to the original application, filed 11 May 2001.
2. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43, and 45-52 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 1-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-43, and 45-52 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 19, 26, 33, 42, 47, 51, and 52 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-19, 21-26, 28-32, 42-43, 45-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley (U.S. Patent 6,694,485 B1) in further view of Warnock (U.S. Patent 5,634,064).

As per claims 1 and 9, Kelley discloses a method and computer program for facilitating enhanced readability of digital documents, including paginating one or more pages of the document into multiple virtual pages (See Kelley, Figure 5, element 102, and Column 7, lines 13-23), identifying and locating lines of text within the one or more pages of the document (See

Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-23), determining whether a virtual page boundary is coextensive with an identified line of text (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-32), and adjusting the virtual page boundary if the boundary is coextensive with the identified line of text so that the boundary is not coextensive with the identified line of text (See Kelley, Column 6, lines 63-67, and Column 7, lines 1-4). Kelley does not disclose expressly that the digital document is a fixed digital document. Warnock discloses obtaining a fixed (or predetermined format) digital document (See Warnock, Figure 3b). Kelley and Warnock are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of viewing electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the fixed digital document of Warnock with the method and program for improving the readability of digital documents of Kelley. The motivation for doing so would have been to present the document so as to appear to the reader in the same manner as was intended by the publisher. (See Warnock, Column 1, lines 63-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Warnock with Kelley for the benefit of providing a familiar visual display of a fixed digital document to the reader to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 9.

As per claim 2, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Kelley also discloses displaying a virtual page of the multiple virtual pages without displaying overlap. (See Kelley, Figure 4, and Column 6, lines 60-62).

As per claim 3, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Kelley also discloses displaying virtual pages of the multiple virtual pages where unrepeatd content of multiple virtual pages starts at a common spatial position on the multiple virtual pages. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 18-23).

Claim 19 is rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 2.

As per claim 4, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Warnock also discloses displaying virtual pages of the multiple virtual pages where a top synthetic virtual-page margin is displayed so that the content of the virtual page starts at a common spatial position, as determined by an offset calculated in pixels. (See Warnock, Figure 7, element 164, and Column 13, lines 38-53). Kelley and Warnock are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of viewing electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the top synthetic virtual-page margin of Warnock with the method and program of Kelley and Warnock. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow for the determination of the end of the article or document by calculating the offset value in relation to the window height. (See Warnock, Column 13, lines 54-56). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Warnock with Kelley for the benefit of determining the end of the article or document to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

As per claim 6, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Kelley also discloses determining a minimum integer number of virtual pages per page of the digital document while maintaining legibility, aspect ratio, and good margins. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-32).

Claims 7-8 are rejected on the same basis as claim 1.

As per claim 11, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Kelley also discloses identifying and locating lines of text within the pages of the digital document. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-23).

As per claim 12, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Kelley also discloses determining whether a virtual-page boundary is coextensive with a line of text. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-23).

As per claim 13, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Kelley also discloses adjusting the virtual-page boundary if the boundary is coextensive with a line of text so that the boundary is not coextensive with the line. (See Kelley, Column 6, lines 63-67, and Column 7, lines 1-4).

As per claim 14, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Kelley also discloses displaying a virtual page of the multiple virtual pages and doing so without displaying overlap. (See Kelley, Figure 4, and Column 6, lines 60-62).

As per claim 15, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Kelley also discloses displaying virtual pages of the multiple virtual pages where unrepeatd content of a multiple virtual page starts at a common spatial position on the multiple virtual page. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 18-23).

As per claim 16, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Kelley also discloses that the paginating includes determining a minimum integer number of virtual pages per page of the digital document while maintaining legibility, aspect ratio, and good margins. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-32).

As per claims 17 and 18, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 9 as described above. Kelley also discloses computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the computer, perform the method recited in claim 9. (See

Kelley, Figure 5, element 102, Column 6, lines 63-67, Column 7, lines 1-4, and Column 7, lines 8-12).

As per claim 21, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Kelley also discloses separating the one or more pages of the digital document into multiple virtual pages without splitting lines of text of the document. (See Kelley, Column 2, lines 22-26).

As per claim 22, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Kelley also discloses identifying lines of text within the digital document (See Kelley, Column 2, lines 22-23), and separating the one or more pages of the digital document into multiple virtual pages between lines of text. (See Kelley, Column 2, lines 34-38).

As per claim 23, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 19 as described above. Kelley also discloses a computer including one or more computer-readable media having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the computer, perform the method recited in claim 19. (See Kelley, Column 7, lines 8-12, and Column 6, lines 60-62).

Claim 24 is rejected on the same basis as claim 16.

Claim 25 is rejected on the same basis as claim 23.

As per claim 26, Kelley discloses a method for enhancing the readability of a digital document including paginating one or more pages of a digital document into multiple virtual pages (See Kelley, Figure 5, element 102, and Column 7, lines 13-23), and displaying virtual pages of the multiple virtual pages where unrepeated content of multiple virtual pages starts at a common spatial position on the multiple virtual pages. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 18-23). Kelley does not disclose expressly lowlighting repeated content on a virtual page.

Warnock also discloses lowlighting or using half-tone to visually identify context within a document. (See Warnock, Column 9, lines 19-24). Kelley and Warnock are analogous art because they are from the same problem-solving area of displaying text online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of the lowlighting or half-tone of Warnock with the method disclosed by Kelley and Warnock. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a visual indicator of the next line of text to be read. (See Warnock, Column 9, lines 14-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Warnock with Kelley for the benefit of identifying the next portion of text to be read to obtain the invention as specified in claim 26.

Claim 28 is rejected on the same basis as claim 21.

Claim 29 is rejected on the same basis as claim 22.

Claim 30 is rejected on the same basis as claim 16.

Claim 31 is rejected on the same basis as claim 23.

Claim 32 is rejected on the same basis as claim 23.

As per claim 42, Kelley discloses a method for facilitating the enhanced readability of a digital document including determining an integer number of virtual pages per page of a digital document while maintaining legibility, aspect ratio, and good margins (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-32), and paginating, accordingly, one or more pages of the digital document into multiple virtual pages. (See Kelley, Figure 5, element 102, and Column 7, lines 8-12). Kelley does not disclose expressly that the digital document is a fixed digital document. Warnock discloses obtaining a fixed (or predetermined format) digital document (See Warnock, Figure 3b). Kelley and Warnock are analogous art because they are from the same field of

endeavor of viewing electronic documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the fixed digital document of Warnock with the method and program for improving the readability of digital documents of Kelley. The motivation for doing so would have been to present the document so as to appear to the reader in the same manner as was intended by the publisher. (See Warnock, Column 1, lines 63-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Warnock with Kelley for the benefit of providing a familiar visual display of a fixed digital document to the reader to obtain the invention as specified in claim 42.

As per claim 43, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 42 as described above. Kelley also discloses determining the minimum integer number of virtual pages per page of the digital document. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-32).

As per claim 45, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 42 as described above. Kelley also discloses displaying one or more of the virtual pages. (See Kelley, Figure 4, and Column 6, lines 60-62).

As per claim 46, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 42 as described above. Kelley also discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions that, when executed by a computer, performs the method recited in claim 42. (See Kelley, Figure 4, Column 7, lines 8-32, and Column 6, lines 60-62).

Claim 47 is rejected on the same basis as claims 11, 12, 18 and 19.

As per claim 48, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 47 as described above. Kelley also discloses a system where the analyzer is configured to identify and locate lines of text within the one or more pages of the digital document (See Kelley, Figure 6, and

Column 7, lines 13-32), determine whether a virtual-page boundary is coextensive with an identified line of text (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-32), and responsive to such determining, adjust the virtual-page boundary if the boundary is coextensive with the identified line of text so that the boundary is not coextensive with the identified line. (See Kelley, Column 6, lines 63-67 and Column 7, lines 1-4).

Claim 51 is rejected on the same basis as claim 17.

Claim 50 is rejected on the same basis as claim 16.

As per claim 49, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 47 as described above. Warnock also discloses lowlighting or using half-tone to visually identify context within a document. (See Warnock, Column 9, lines 19-24). Kelley also discloses that the overlap of one virtual page includes content of the document repeated from another virtual page (See Kelley, Figures 1 and 2, noting that lines 30 and 40 of Figure 2 are repeating lines 10 and 20 from Figure 1). Kelley and Warnock are analogous art because they are from the same problem-solving area of displaying text online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the use of the lowlighting or half-tone of Warnock with the method disclosed by Kelley and Warnock. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a visual indicator of the next line of text to be read. (See Warnock, Column 9, lines 14-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Warnock with Kelley for the benefit of identifying the next portion of text to be read to obtain the invention as specified in claim 49.

Claim 52 is rejected on the same basis as claims 31, 47 and 49.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley (U.S. Patent 6,694,485 B1) in view of Warnock (U.S. Patent 5,634,064) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Baum (U.S. Patent 6,188,779 B1).

As per claim 5, Kelley and Warnock disclose the limitations of claim 1 as described above. Kelley and Warnock do not disclose expressly performing at least minimal OCR on content of the document to locate line boundaries. Baum discloses performing OCR on the content of a document to determine boundaries. (See Baum, Column 5, lines 65-67, and Column 6, lines 1-27). Kelley, Warnock, and Baum are analogous art because they are from the same problem-solving area of paginating digital documents. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the OCR of the content of the document of Baum with the method and program for improving the readability of digital documents of Kelley and Warnock. The motivation for doing so would have been to identify regions of the document that are tightly defined about the probable text. (See Baum, Column 5, line 67, and Column 6, lines 1-2) Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Baum with Kelley and Warnock for the benefit of locating gaps between tightly defined regions of text within the document to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

6. Claims 33-37, and 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley (U.S. Patent 6,694,485 B1) in view of Warnock (U.S. Patent 5,634,064) and Atkinson (U.S. Patent 4,622,545).

As per claim 33, Kelley discloses a method for improving the readability of a digital document including paginating one or more pages of the digital document into multiple virtual

pages (See Kelley, Figure 5, element 102, and Column 7, lines 8-12), and displaying one or more virtual pages of the multiple virtual pages and doing so without overlap on a virtual page, where the overlap of one virtual page includes content of the document repeated from another virtual page. (See Kelley, Figure 4, and Column 6, lines 60-62). Kelley does not disclose expressly that the digital document is a fixed digital document. Kelley also does not disclose expressly indicating overlap during the displaying, where the content of overlap is differentiated from other content. Warnock discloses a fixed (or predetermined format) digital document (See Warnock, Figure 3b). Atkinson discloses indicating overlap that is differentiated from other content. (See Atkinson, Figure 7, and Column 10, lines 19-36). Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying data online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the fixed digital document of Warnock with the method and program for improving the readability of digital documents of Kelley. The motivation for doing so would have been to present the document so as to appear to the reader in the same manner as was intended by the publisher. (See Warnock, Column 1, lines 63-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Warnock with Kelley for the benefit of providing a familiar visual display of a fixed digital document to the reader. It also would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the indication of overlapping data of Atkinson with the method and program for improving the readability of digital documents of Kelley and Warnock. The motivation for doing so would have been to mask the regions of the data that are currently being displayed. (See Atkinson, Column 10, lines 37-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Atkinson with Kelley and Warnock for the benefit of identifying lines of data already displayed to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

As per claim 35, Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson disclose the limitations of claim 33 as described above. Kelley also discloses displaying virtual pages of the multiple virtual pages where unrepeated content of multiple virtual pages starts at a common spatial position on the multiple virtual pages. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 18-23).

As per claim 37, Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson disclose the limitations of claim 33 as described above. Warnock also discloses that the overlap is shaded or highlighted in reverse video. (See Warnock, Column 9, lines 19-24). Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying data online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the shading of Warnock with the method and program for improving the readability of digital documents of Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a visual indicator of the next line of text to be read. (See Warnock, Column 9, lines 14-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Warnock with Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson for the benefit of identifying the next portion of text to be read to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

As per claim 39, Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson disclose the limitations of claim 33 as described above. Kelley also discloses determining a minimum integer number of virtual pages per page of the digital document while maintaining legibility, aspect ratio, and good margins. (See Kelley, Figure 6, and Column 7, lines 13-32).

Claims 40 and 41 are rejected on the same basis as claim 33.

As per claims 34 and 36, Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson disclose the limitations of claim 33 as described above. Warnock also discloses lowlighting or using half-tone to visually identify context within a document. (See Warnock, Column 9, lines 19-24). Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying data online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the lowlighting or half-tone of Warnock with the method and program for improving the readability of digital documents of Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide a visual indicator of the next line of text to be read. (See Warnock, Column 9, lines 14-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Warnock with Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson for the benefit of identifying the next portion of text to be read to obtain the invention as specified in claims 34 and 36.

7. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kelley (U.S. Patent 6,694,485 B1), Warnock (U.S. Patent and Atkinson (U.S. Patent 4,622,545) as applied to claim 33 above, and further in view of Bereiter (U.S. Patent 5,909,217).

As per claim 38, Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson disclose the limitations of claim 33 as described above. Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson do not disclose expressly that the overlap is grayed. Bereiter discloses graying out portions of overlap. (See Bereiter, Figure 3, and Column 4, lines 35-49). Kelley, Warnock, Atkinson and Bereiter are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of displaying data online. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to including the graying out of overlapping data of Bereiter with the method and program for improving the readability of

digital documents of Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson. The motivation for doing so would have been to help present the context of the non-grayed data. (See Bereiter, Column 4, lines 43-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bereiter with Kelley, Warnock and Atkinson for the benefit of emphasizing the context of the page to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 22 July 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

9. Regarding Applicant's argument on Page 14 of the Instant Amendment, which states that Kelley fails to teach multiple virtual pages (See Instant Amendment, Page 14, lines 20-22), the Office respectfully disagrees. Kelley uses tables to determine the correct number of rows that can be displayed in full on a computer screen (See Kelley, Column 7, lines 13-23). Rows of text or data displayed on a computer screen represent "virtual pages", as defined by Applicant in the specification of the Instant Application (See Applicant's Specification, Page 7, lines 8-9).

10. Regarding Applicant's argument on Page 15 of the Instant Amendment, which states that Kelley fails to teach that lines of text are associated with pages of a document (See Instant Amendment, Page 15, lines 6-7), the Office respectfully disagrees. Kelley teaches a method for positioning the text of a hypertext markup language (HTML) file on a display screen linked to a computer such that no partial lines of text are displayed and without redisplay of the text that was

displayed on a previous screen (See Kelley, Abstract). As is well known in the art, Hypertext markup language is used for documents on the Web (See Microsoft Computer Dictionary, Page 238, definition of HTML). Therefore, the HTML file of Kelley teaches the limitation of pages of a document.

11. Regarding Applicant's argument on Page 15 of the Instant Amendment, which states that Kelley fails to teach virtual page boundaries (See Instant Amendment, Page 15, lines 22-23), the Office respectfully disagrees. Kelley teaches a method for positioning the text of a hypertext markup language (HTML) file on a display screen linked to a computer such that no partial lines of text are displayed and without redisplay of the text that was displayed on a previous screen (See Kelley, Abstract). Applicant shows that a "virtual page boundary" is the screen boundary of the computer display upon which the document is displayed (See Instant Application, Figure 7, Element 350ab). Therefore, Kelley teaches the limitation of virtual page boundaries.

12. Regarding Applicant's argument on Page 16 of the Instant Amendment, which states that Kelley fails to teach adjusting a boundary (See Instant Amendment, Page 16, lines 11-12), the Office respectfully disagrees. Kelley teaches positioning text by determining the absolute number of lines of text to be displayed on the screen prior to presenting the text to the user. Kelley teaches the use of a table to determine the number of rows to be displayed. For instance, if 24 rows fit on the virtual page, only 24 lines of text will be displayed (See Kelley, Column 7, lines 13-58). Thus, the boundary of the page is adjusted based on the number of virtual rows available on the display screen.

13. Regarding Applicant's argument on Page 18 of the Instant Amendment, which states that Kelley fails to teach a common spatial position (See Instant Amendment, Page 18, lines 1-2), the Office respectfully disagrees. Kelley teaches the use of a table to determine the number of rows to be displayed. For instance, if 24 rows fit on the virtual page, only 24 lines of text will be displayed (See Kelley, Column 7, lines 13-58). Kelley also teaches that the text displayed on each virtual page begins on the first available row of the computer screen (See Kelley, Figure 6). Thus, the common spatial position is the first row of the computer screen.

14. Regarding Applicant's argument on Page 18 of the Instant Amendment, which states that Kelley fails to teach determining an integer number of virtual pages (See Instant Amendment, Page 18, lines 21-24), the Office respectfully disagrees. Kelley teaches positioning text by determining the absolute number of lines of text to be displayed on the screen prior to presenting the text to the user. Kelley teaches the use of a table to determine the number of rows to be displayed. For instance, if 24 rows fit on the virtual page, only 24 lines of text will be displayed (See Kelley, Column 7, lines 13-58). Each line of text is associated with a line on the screen (See Kelley, Figure 6). This process is repeated until all data in the document is displayed (See Kelley, Figure 7). It is notoriously obvious that one skilled in the art at the time of the invention could easily determine an integer value representing the number of virtual pages based on the repeating Screen Row Number data as taught by Kelley.

15. Regarding Applicant's argument on Page 21 of the Instant Amendment, which states that Kelley fails to teach that the overlap of one virtual page includes content of the document repeated from another virtual page (See Instant Amendment, Page 21, lines 6-10), the Office respectfully disagrees. Kelley teaches a method for positioning the text of a hypertext markup language (HTML) file on a display screen linked to a computer such that no partial lines of text are displayed and without redisplay of the text that was displayed on a previous screen (See Kelley, Abstract). Kelley also teaches that it is well known in the art to re-display or repeat content of a document from one virtual page to a second virtual page when overlap occurs (See Kelley, Column 6, lines 55-62, and Column 5, lines 64-67, Column 6, line 1).

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

18. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
9/21/2005